

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Naren Chaganti, et al.

S.No. 09/634,725	ART UNIT:2132
FILED: AUGUST 5, 2000	EXAMINER: BENJAMIN LANIER
TITLE: ONLINE PERSONAL LIBRARY	DOCKET No: PSCO-007

PRE-INTERVIEW DISCUSSION POINTS

Assistant commissioner for Patents
Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This document is prepared in anticipation of a telephone interview. Please consider the following points:

1. The office action states, “However, the online repository described in the ‘796 application does not store multimedia content.” See page 2, ¶ 2 of the Office Action. But this appears a misreading of the ‘796 application, which states:

It should be noted that the user’s social security number or alias can illustratively be used as primary keys to access the information from the tables. Other methods, such as date of birth, mother’s maiden name, finger print scan, retina scan, or a combination of these methods can be used in other embodiments. The types of fields used in the illustration include Number [0-9]; Character [A-Za-z0-9 and other special characters such as ASCII characters]; and multimedia methods of storage for other types of data.

See Ser. No. 09/478,796, at page 8, line 25 to page 9, line 2 (underline added). Examples are given for different types of data formats: social security number may be represented via regular expression [0-9], mother’s maiden name may be represented via the expression [A-Za-z0-9 and other special characters such as ASCII characters] and “multimedia methods of storage” may be used to represent “finger print scan, retina scan, or a combination of these methods.” It appears that the office action overlooked this description of the Specification. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

2. As to Meyer, the office action appears to have overlooked that Ser. No. 09/478,796 described copyrighting information objects and using copyrighting to control the use of the information objects. See Ser. No. 09/478,796 at page 18, lines 21-22, which states:

Further, this [copyrighting or contractually protecting the information objects] could be a selling point to users, since the PIRSP not only guarantees the safety of the stored information, but in addition controls how this information is used.

Thus, the parent application has precedence over Meyer for controlling the use of information. Applicants propose to amend Claim 24 as follows:

24. (previously amended) A method of providing online repository services to a plurality of users by a service provider operating a server computer connected to the Internet, said Internet being capable of transmitting and/or receiving one or more information objects, each said information object comprising voice, video, data, text and/or any combinations thereof, said server computer configured to hold information objects, for each of the plurality of users, said each of the plurality of users having an account with the server computer, the method comprising the following steps performed by the server computer:

- allocating storage to store a first user's information as the user's online repository;

- assigning an address for the first user's online repository;

- receiving the first user's account information;

- receiving an information object;

- storing the information object in the first user's online repository;

and

- if the information object is copyright-protected, then

- controlling the use of the information object in accord with the copyright of the information object.

- ~~examining license information for the copyright-protected information object to determine a number N (where $N \geq 1$) of simultaneous users who could access the copyright-protected information object; and~~

- ~~allowing no more than N simultaneous users to access the copyright-protected information object.~~

This claim is believed to overcome both Meyer and Glassman as references. We also propose a dependent claim that contains the remainder of the language of Claim 24, for example:

Claim 24a. (New) The method as in claim 24, wherein the step of controlling the use of the information object comprises the steps of:

- examining license information for the copyright-protected information object to determine a number N (where $N \geq 1$) of simultaneous users who could access the copyright-protected information object; and

- allowing no more than N simultaneous users to access the copyright-protected information object.

Applicants previously believed that this re-recitation was unnecessary to overcome the references, but despite several iterations and telephone interviews, they were unable to persuade the Office.

As to claim 26, Applicants submit that none of the cited references teaches the steps:

permitting access of the copyright-protected information object in accordance with the time constraint imposed by the license information;
and
disabling access to the copyright-protected information object upon expiration of the predetermined time (T_{license}).

Alternatively, applicants propose to re-write the claim so that it is dependent on the revised Claim 24 as follows.

Claim 24b. (New) The method as in claim 24, wherein the step of controlling the use of the information object comprises the steps of:
receiving license information for the copyright-protected information object, said license information indicating that the license is for access of the information object for a predetermined time (T_{license});
permitting access of the copyright-protected information object in accordance with the time constraint imposed by the license information;
and
disabling access to the copyright-protected information object upon expiration of the predetermined time (T_{license}).

A similar change is proposed to amend other claims.

Applicants believe that these changes are not necessary because the parent application has sufficient disclosure to overcome Meyer as a reference. Examiner's views are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Naren Chaganti/ Reg. No. 44,602
Naren Chaganti

November 21, 2011